The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. VII, No. 6 | *"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."* | December, 1957

Canadian Company Announces Program For Sixth Festival

Director Michael Langham has announced *I Henry IV, Much Ado About Nothing,* and *The Winter's Tale* as The Stratford Festival Company's sixth annual program at Stratford, Ontario, Canada. The program will run for twelve weeks—two weeks longer than the 1957 season. The final week will feature matinee and evening performances for the benefit of groups of high school students. Mr. Langham will direct *I HIV* and *Much Ado* and Douglas Campbell will direct *W.T.*, Tanya Moiseiwitsch will design the 1st and 3rd plays and Desmond Heeley the 2nd. *I HIV* and *Much Ado* will open on June 23 and 24 respectively. *WT* will open on July 21.

Among the stars held over from last year are Christopher Plummer cast as Benedict and Leontes, Douglas Campbell as Falstaff, and Frances Hyland as Lady Percy, Hermione and Perdita. Eileen Herlie has been newly imported from Glasgow to star as Beatrice. Miss Herlie was Sir Lawrence Oliver's Gertrude in the film *Hamlet.*

The Stratford Festival Company's first touring company will take the road on February 12th with two plays-Heinrich Von Kleist's *The Broken Jug,* and Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen of Verona,* both directed and designed by Mr. Langham and Miss Moiseiwitsch. It will conclude its tour with a six week's run at the Phoenix Theatre in New York City from March 17th to April 26th. The *TG of V* is conceived as "a fairy tale version of the middle ages seen through 19th century eyes." Mr. Langham feels that the play will be more readily appreciated "if regarded through the atmosphere and moral convention of the last century."

NYC Festival May Get Elizabethan Stage

Plans have been drawn up to build a permanent Elizabethan type stage and an area seating 2000 for the New York City Festival Company, headed by Joseph Papp. John A. Mulcahy of the park department announced that present plans also include the erection of two buildings — one for dressing quarters and storage and another for offices, lighting controls, and sound equipment. The paved area will slope toward Belvedere Lake and will resemble an amphitheatre radiating from three sides of the projecting stage. The estimated cost is $150,000. Meanwhile $50,000 is being sought for the 12 week free program for the 1958 season.

The winter program at the Hecksher Theatre opened on Nov. 25 with *RIII.* Brooks Atkinson of the *N. Y. Times* thought the play suited to "Mr. Vaughan's roaring style" with more "refinement of speech and of character" needed for indoor performances.

As You Like It and *Antony and Cleopatra* are also scheduled. Each play will run for 8 weeks.

Old Vic Completing Canon This Season

Presented as a part of the fifth and final season of the folio plan at the Old Vic Theatre, Margaret Webster's production of *MforM* drew accolades from the London *Times* which found her hold in the play so firm that she was able to get "uncommonly good performances in the minor parts" and was able to "swing the (play) across at the point at which the story breaks its back" and to bring it to a conclusion which holds the stage entertainingly.

Anthony Nicholls appeared as Duke Vincentio with John Neville as Angelo. Barry Kay designed the production and Lehman Engel composed accompanying music.

Neville also appeared in the leading role in the company's production of *Hamlet* which opened this season and gave what *Theatre World* called an "outstanding performance." Michael Benthall produced the play.

Douglas Seale's production of the *Henry VI* plays, in which thirty-five players wearing two hundred costumes appeared in ninety different parts, marked the second event of the current season. The part of Gloucester was played by Derek Godfrey, Barbara Jefford was Margaret of Anjou, and Paul Daneman made his first appearance at the Old Vic in the title role.

A Midsummer Night's Dream opened on December 23 for a six-week run, offering Joyce Redman as Titania and Frankie Howerd as Bottom.

Paul Rogers will rejoin the company to play King Lear early in the New Year and Dame Edith Evans together with John Gielgud will star in Michael Benthall's production of *Henry VIII* next spring.

Picture of the Old Vic's *Hamlet* can be found in *Theatre World* of November.

Heilman's "The Magic Web" Wins Explicator Award

Robert B. Heilman, professor of English, University of Washington, has received a $200 award from *The Explicator* for the best book of *explication de texte* published in 1956. His book, *The Magic Web: Action and Language in Othello,* was unanimously chosen as the best in literary analysis in the field of English or American literature. The judges were Professors Elizabeth Nitchie of Goucher, Charles C. Walcutt of Queens (NYC), and William K. Wimsatt, Jr. of Yale.

98th Festival Season Closes At Stratford-Upon-Avon

The Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Stratford-on-Avon, has announced that its final production of the ninety-eighth season, *The Tempest,* starring John Gielgud, is opening for a special seven-week Christmas season at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane. Designed and directed by Peter Brook, the production's other leading players are Alex Clunes as Caliban, Robert Harris as Alonso and Mark Dignam as Antonio.

Rosemary Anne Sisson, commenting upon the Stratford production in the *Stratford-Upon-Avon Herald* noted that the difficulty with *The Tempest* is whether this last comedy of Shakespeare's is to be performed as a dramatic poem, a vehicle for a star actor, a "playground for an ingenious producer," or if a balance can be found among these three.

It is her opinion that the Stratford *Tempest* showed "some feeling of contest between actor and producer" and that though there was plenty of spectacle, it "riots almost too abundantly" and Sir John Gielgud does not altogether emerge as the winner.

Among this season's other productions which included *AYLI* *King John* and *Cymbeline, Julius Caesar* was singled out for special praise by reviewers who called it "exciting" (W. A. Darlington) and a play of "genuine realism" (R. Sisson). Alex Clunes as Brutus and Richard Johnson as Antony were especially applauded, the latter being termed by W. A. Darlington the "year's find among our actors."

Cymbeline, the season's fourth production was regarded as a rather "uncertain" production, but Dame Peggy Ashcroft's performance as Imogen was a "distinguished piece of acting." Peter Hall directed and Robert Harris appeared as Cymbeline, with Geoffrey Kean as Iachimo.

The Tempest is the fifth Stratford production to have appeared in London others being *A&C* (1953), *KL* and *Much Ado* (1955) and *Titus Andronicus* which followed its successful Continental tour with a five-week London season in July.

Pictures of *Julius Caesar* and other of the Theatre's productions for the 1957 season are available in the summer editions of *Theatre World.*

Existence of "Love's Labor's Won" Established

Publication of T. W. Baldwin's *Shakspere's Love's Labor's Won* on Nov. 14 (Southern Illinois University Press, pp. viii, 42, 4 plates, $5.00) makes it rather certain that "there was a play printed under the title of *Love's Labor's Won.*" When bookseller Christopher Hunt set up business in Exeter in August of 1603, he received books from London among which he listed "*love's labor lost* and *loves labor won,*" which is closer to the 1598 Quarto *Loues labors lost* (*Loves Labor's Lost*) in the running title) than Meres' "Loves labors lost."

The *Merchant of Venice* and *Taming of a Shrew* were also listed.

The leaf on which these volumes were listed was one of two which were used in 1638 for binding of Gataker's *Certaine Sermons.* Professor Baldwin is not certain whether *LLW* is a play which survived under another name, but "we are now assured that there was in print" such a play attributed indirectly to Shakespeare by its association with *LLL.*

If such a play exists now under a new name, internal and external evidence of dating leaves only *MforM* and *All's Well* as possibilities, with the latter being most probably.

SNL reminds its readers that four leaves of the 1598 Quarto of *I HIV* were once found in the binding of a copy of William Thomas's *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammar,* so there is some hope that a *LLW* may yet be found.

Oregon Festival Extends 1958 Season

Advance ticket sales for the eighteeth season of the Oregon Shakespearean Festival at Ashland, Oregon are the heaviest in the 23-year history of the organization. The "Stay Four Days, See Four Plays", slogan has produced many sales of 8 ticket memberships for $17.50—a saving of 10% over the usual $2.40 admission price for the best seats.

The four plays for the 1958 thirty-nine day season—July 28 through Sept. 4—are *The M of V* and *Troilus and Cressida* directed by James Sandoe of the University of Colorado and *King Lear* and *Much Ado About Nothing* directed by Robert Loper of Stanford University. The staging of *Troilus and Cressida* completes the presentation of the complete Shakespeare canon at Ashland.

Final figures for the 1957 season totaled 24,338.

Second Phoenix Festival Announces Program

The Taming of the Shrew directed by John W. Paul of Phoenix College, *Twelfth Night,* directed by Frank R. Byers, and *Othello,* directed by Robert Begam of Arizona State College, are to be presented at the 2nd Annual Shakespeare Festival in Phoenix, Arizona. Dates for the Festival are April 10th to April 19th inclusive.

THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER
Published at Kent, Ohio
Editor and Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Charles Stanley Felver, Assistant Editor
David Unumb, Editorial Assistant
Department of English
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
Kent, Ohio

Six issues annually—Feb., April, May, Sept., Nov., Dec.—Annual Subscription $1.00
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office, Kent, Ohio

Vol. VII, No. 6 December, 1957

A VOYAGE TO DELYRIA

The Elizabethan gallant who sat on the stage in the 16th Century was close enough to touch the actors, heard well, and was, we hope, not in the way of the audience OR the actors.

The modern televiewer has, as it were, as good a seat as the Elizabethan gentleman, but what he sees must be a far cry from what the Elizabethan saw. The Hallmark Playhouse *Twelfth Night*, from our point of view, was even a few steps removed from some of the inanities of excessively activated legitimate stage productions.

Some of our *avant garde* friends still brag that they have no television. Its presentations are beneath them—too popular, not cultural enough, slanted to the masses who would rather see and be titillated, than read and be intellectually stimulated.

It must have been the mass audience that the Hallmark *TN* was geared to—and it was always in high gear. From our point of view there was far too much action; too much dancing and cavorting, masking, and prancing; all sorts of zany figures with a commedia dell' arte motif, midgets, characters hanging from trees, Sir Toby pushed around in a wheel chair, and Malvolio (Maurice Evans) his usual priggish self, but now with a ripe cockney accent. The girls were beautiful, the men, except for Sir Andrew, handsome, but the effect for the most part was lost in the spectacle. This was a TV spectacular. The producers must have spent a fortune, but I doubt that anyone left their sets wanting to go back to Shakespeare. To our mind this type of performance would have the opposite effect: Why read Shakespeare? Who could visualize such effects?

We are not saying that Shakespeare is to be read rather than acted, but rather, that Shakespeare should be acted for what he has written. Far too often,—and we have said this before—Shakespeare is made a vehicle to show the talents of those who produce, design, and direct him.

"This Above All . . ."

This is not an inopportune moment to say that Piper Laurie withdrew from the role of Viola because "such drastic changes were made in the script" that "the part of Viola bore little resemblance to . . . Shakespeare's play or the TV adaptation for which [she] had accepted the role. Therefore the role became one in which I could no longer believe. I had to yield either to established authorities or be true to myself." Mildred Freed Alberg, executive producer, disclaimed the drastic changes.

Season's Greetings

Horace Howard Furness

Philip H. Highfill, Jr., Geo. Washington Univ.

Horace H. Furness (1833-1912), grew up in Philadelphia in a family of transplanted Bostonians. Often to the house of his clergyman father, Abolitionist and friend of Emerson, came Channing, Garrison, and other liberals. Howard entered Harvard at 16, self-prepared, and earned his way tutoring.

Furness, whose father's house had harbored fugitive slaves, chided Carlyle for callousness to slavery, and helped spirit John Brown's body through Philadelphia, but deafness kept him out of the Union army. For fifty years his silver ear trumpet was at the centers of gatherings of Philadelphia's learned, and though deprived of drama and concert he did not allow his deafness to dilute social joy. At his country place "Lindenshade" he held his guests in thrall with tales of Lincoln and his friend Whitman. He often gave his golden voice to Shakespeare readings for charity. When, as a white-haired old man, he read *A&C* to a group of friends at Cambridge, the power of his tones when he applied the imaginary asp and said "Dost thou not see my baby at my breast that sucks the nurse asleep," was such that his hearers' eyes filled. Charles Eliot Norton murmured "My dear Furness, you make us cry." An ironic insistence by this deaf man that no play could be understood rightly except in the theater was a major influence on his scholarship. Furness gave credit for awakening his Shakespearean interest to Fanny Kemble (long his father's parishioner) who once gave him a season ticket to her famous Shakespearean readings.

The New Variorum

About 1862 Furness pasted notes from five editions of *Hamlet* into the 1821 *Variorum* for his own use. From this amalgam came his idea for a complete new variorum edition of Shakespeare. Freed by deafness and independent means both from the obligation and the necessity of following his profession, law, he spent most of the next fifty years on fifteen monumental volumes: *R&J*, 1871; *Macbeth*, 1873; *Hamlet* (2 vols.), 1877; *Lear*, 1880; *Othello*, 1886; *MV*, 1888; *AYLI*, 1890; *Tempest*, 1892; *MND*, 1895; *WT*, 1898; *Much Ado*, 1899; *TN*, 1901; *LLL*, 1904; *A&C*, 1907; and *Cymbeline*, published posthumously in 1913. (His son took over the editorship at his father's death.)

Furness was a stubbornly conservative editor. After the first three plays, in which he used a text of his own construction, he employed that of his copy of the First Folio. Unstirred to either wrath or reform by strictures against his extreme caution in matters textual, with resources and resolution enough to work at his own pace, protected in a measure from annoyance by his own deafness, he worked doggedly on. At first his was the unseen hand, arranging and sifting evidence and opinions by others. But by the later volumes, most notes dealing with disputed points ended with his authoritative decision. Willing to publish all serious conjectures about mysterious passages, he serenely refused to join the "guessing game" of emendation. "Those who know the most," he said, "venture the least." After the death of his wife, ceaseless work, used at first to dull grief, hardened into habit. Going to gardening and book-collecting for refreshment, surrounded by his innumerable cats, courteously answering all enquiry, he still saved the center of his mind for the *Variorum*. Working far toward morning, he laboriously compiled and collated. In preparing the text for *Othello*, for example, he went twice over every word of each of forty-odd editions. His engaging letters, which show a man of wit and spirit, demonstrate also that he was not always quite serene, especially toward the last. He wrote W. Aldis Wright in 1897: "As I grow older the drudgery of it all oppresses me . . . the damnable iteration after all the first ardour has subsided. Don't be surprised if you sometime hear that I have abandoned it all, and gone off to Borneo, or Sumatra, to cruise endlessly in summer seas."

SHAKESPEARE AT THE OLD VIC 1956 - 57

By Mary Clarke

A lucid commentary highlights this handsomely illustrated volume on the Shakespearean plays produced at the Old Vic in the 1956-57 season—*Timon of Athens, Cymbeline, Much Ado About Nothing, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, The Merchant of Venice, Antony and Cleopatra, Titus Andronicus, The Comedy of Errors* and *King Richard III*.

Coming in February

117 photos Prob. $5.00

TRAGEDY

By William G. McCollom

Hailed by a noted American scholar as "the most sensible book on the subject I have read in recent years," this work is both a theoretical study of the tragic art and an evaluation of significant tragic writing, ancient and modern. Focusing on Sophocles, Shakespeare, Racine and Ibsen as a tragic norm, Dr. McCollom masterfully explores the main elements of the art. Particularly valuable are the chapters on the relation between tragedy and society in selected periods—Athenian, Elizabethan, Norwegian and French.

$5.00

A PICTURE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH THEATRE

By Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson

A treasury of over 500 drawings and photographs from the internationally famous Mander and Mitchenson Theatre Collection. Conveniently divided into historical periods—from pre-Elizabethan times to the present—here are illustrations and discussions on theatres, settings, productions, and actors and actresses. Included are over 100 pictures of featured performers and scenes from Shakespearean plays. A collector's item!

$5.95

The Macmillan Company
60 FIFTH AVE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

LANDMARKS OF CRITICISM

Marvin Felheim
Visiting Fellow, The Shakespeare Institute

"On the FAULTS of Shakespeare"

William Richardson

[*Ch. XII of Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Characters, London, 1797 (5th ed.). First ed. 1784.*]

Shakespeare's *merits* ("the ardours of poetical fancy, the energies of strong expression, and unrivalled skill in delineating human nature") have never been over-rated, but his *faults* ("his inattention to the laws of unity, his deviations from geographical and historical truth, his rude mixtures of tragic and comic scenes, the vulgarity and even indecency of language") have been regarded with excessive indulgence. "To censure him for his faults is . . . necessary . . . for offenses against taste are more dangerous in men of genius than in other persons."

The basis for judgment is taste: "consummate taste requires that we be capable of feeling what is excellent; that we be capable, in some measure, of discerning the parts, and correspondence of parts, which, in works of invention, occasion excellence; and that we have competent knowledge in those things which are the subjects of an artist's labour."

Too frequently "the man of poetic invention" possesses merely feelings; and "he may want discernment"; "feelings are of a shifting and versatile nature"; they are not dependable. True taste must be capable not only of feeling but of judging. And judgments, unlike feelings, must be "established upon maxims . . . which derive their force and stability from reason and deep reflection." The man of mere sensibility will always "be apt to fall into error."

Shakespeare a Man of Feeling

Because he "wrote under the influence of feeling," Shakespeare was capable of "the greatest blemishes" (he lacked both "the discernment of the philosophical" and "the knowledge of the learned critic"). His great error was "to follow nature." True, it is natural that "persons of high rank may adapt their conversation to the meanest of their associates" and "mighty men may be coarse and offensive," but the dramatist must not show these things (except in comedy) for "there is a certain consistency or unity of passion, emotion, and sentiment, to be observed in fine writing; not less important than unity of action, and of much greater consequence than the unities either of time or of place." If a writer mixes such things together, the "coarser and more tumultous feeling" will generally overpower the "finer." Note Milton's success in *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* where he disdains any mixture; and in music and painting "we find nothing so inconsistent as the dissonant mixture of sentiments and emotions so frequent in English tragedy." So we must improve upon nature: "if we would describe a cheerful landscape, we must avoid mentioning the gloomy forests, or deep morasses, which may actually exist in it . . . In like manner, the poet who excludes from tragedy mean persons and vulgar language, because they are dissonant to the general tone of his work, neither violates nature" (he adds to the reality) "nor trespasses against the great obligation he is under of affording us pleasure."

A "conception of excellence is natural to the human mind"; therefore we judge the "civilized European" superior to "the wild American savage," just as a "pruned and grafted" tree bears better fruit than one "left to its original luxuriancy." In copying "the reality of external things," Shakespeare "disregarded that conception of excellence which seems inherent in the human mind." As a result, he did not preserve in his tragedies "the proper tone."

"His other blemishes are less enormous, and proceed chiefly from his want of critical and historical knowledge" (*e.g.*, he "represented Alexander as existing prior to the age of Coriolanus") or "from carelessness in correcting his works." Like Otway, he was misled by being too conscious of the (degraded) public taste of his age. "To point out" these imperfections and "endeavour to trace their causes" may be of service in preventing "ingenious men" from overlooking or imitating his faults.

SHAKESPEARE FOR THE RETARDED*

By Elsie Katterjohn, North Chicago High School

Julius Caesar in Modern English takes a step beyond other attempts to "simplify" Shakespeare for hampered readers in the public schools. It is neither Shakespeare nor a substitute for Shakespeare—nor does it pretend to be. Rather, it is designedly a modern "Lamb's Tale" in drama form, planned as a tool for classrooms in which problems exist in the teaching of classical literature. Its purpose is to promote an interest in Shakespeare among readers who would not otherwise have this interest, and—in possible cases—to lead to the reading of Shakespeare in the original. Experimental work with this version at Community High School, North Chicago, Illinois, indicates that the intended result is usually obtained.

There have, of course, been other attempts to simplify Shakespeare. They have included cuttings, line-by-line "translation" printed beside the Shakespearean columns, and slipping modern words into Elizabethan phrases, rewording occasional lines, etc. *Julius Caesar in Modern English*, however, avoids the "distortion" of Shakespearean lines by not *using* Shakespearean lines. Note that the title does not read "Shakespeare's Julius Caesar in Modern English," but "Julius Caesar in Modern English." Students are aware from the beginning that they are not reading Shakespeare, but are *preparing* to read him. The preliminary section, called "Before You Read the Play," explains this to them.

Need for the Text

The project developed out of a need of which the author became increasingly aware during thirty years' experience in teaching English. With "all the children of all the people" enrolled, perforce, in educational institutions beyond eighth grade, and with elementary classrooms and curriculum crowded to the impracticable point, the general character of the public high-school population has changed vitally. Many of the young people entering high school are reading at fifth, sixth, and seventh-grade level,—some even at third and fourth. Backgrounds are meager. For the past twenty years, much of the author's classwork has been with pupils of this type.

Even among those who have the ability to read more difficult material, there is a preference for the fast-moving story. Perhaps this is a natural development of our times,—our highly-geared age of atomic power and televised action. At any rate, adolescent readers are, on the whole, unwilling to slow themselves to the pace of research and consideration, of reference to footnotes, of line-by-line translation from sixteenth-century phraseology to more understandable terms. They are impatient with complicated sentance structure. They want to "read right along."

Confronted with these situations, teachers frequently omit Shakespeare and other classical writers, except in sectioned classes of college-bound or literary-minded students, because the "average" groups—and lower—either cannot read such material or hate to. Forcing the issue merely deepens the feeling of distaste for books.

Outside the upper-level sections (largely college-preparatory), more and more of the public school graduates are finishing their formal education quite unacquainted with such well-known characters as Brutus, Antony, Caesar. Perhaps we owe these students something more: familiarity with at least the stories and characters of some of our greatest literature. They are not, then, complete blanks when they hear references to such materials, and they are less likely to turn off the television set when a Shakespearean play is announced. In fact, a fortunate experience with a modern English version may lead some students to tackle the original version on their own. Cases of this development have been observed at North Chicago.

Preparation of the Text

Julius Caesar in Modern English, then, was prepared because the author is convinced that such an aid is needed. It was built to specification, mainly for classes reading below grade level.

The wording is purposely colloquial, resembling the everyday speech of the readers for whom it is intended—*sans* grammatical error and slang. Literary language—poetic phrasing—have been deliberately avoided.

Technically, the book reveals some startling innovations, designed to remove hazards for retarded readers. Material customarily italicized in plays is here printed in regular type. Footnotes have been avoided, too, by placing informational notes in parentheses within the play. Thus the student may "read right along" as in a story. The drama form, however, also provides the fun of "reading parts"—possibly with a narrator voicing stage directions.

At North Chicago, *Julius Caesar in Modern English* is used as follows:

Sophomore classes reading at grade-levels 4, 5, 6 read the modern English version and the "most famous lines" section published at the back of the book in Shakespeare's wording. Those reading at grades 7 and 8 read the modern English version and selected scenes from the original. Students reading at normal grade level may, if the teacher wishes, read the modern English edition rapidly before going into the complete Shakespearean version. This procedure is recommended. Top classes, reading above grade level, are not assigned the modern English edition at all.

In the lower sections, emphasis is placed on the reading-improvement technique that is built into the book: reading to answer questions. As the introduction explains, the same questions may be used for follow-up discussion if the teacher wishes.

There are, of course, many professional people who oppose the use of any Shakespearean material other than the original, and who feel their viewpoint is justified. In some ways, no doubt it is. But to those who would cry "sacrilege," the author would ask which is the greater sin: to take advantage of simple aids toward acquaintanceship with Shakespeare, or to persist in a blind devotion that can only result in mass numbers of people not knowing him at all?

*[More than three years ago (*SNL*, IV:3:23) we reviewed Greenwalt and Hochberger's *The Student's Macbeth* (Globe Book Co., 1954), a High School text with profuse line by line notes and paraphrase in parallel columns. In their introduction the editors defended their work saying that "In no sense has the text been watered down, cheapened, or vulgarized." (Their italics.) The aim of the editors was to make it easier for the student to understand Shakespeare. The aim was laudable, although we thought the notes disconcerting in their prolixity.

Several weeks ago, publication of Elsie M. Katterjohn's edition of *Julius Caesar in Modern English: Adapted from Shakespeare's Play*, (Scott, Forseman&Company, pp. 120, Chicago), produced the charge of vulgarization from one of our departmental colleagues. When the editor wrote to Miss Katterjohn suggesting a defense of her position he received a thought-provoking letter which was trasformed into the preceding article. Readers may agree that in an era of universal education some such method is the only one possible if the substance of the classics is to be retained in the curriculum. Comments are invited.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Charles Beecher Hogan, Shakespeare in the Theatre, Oxford University Press, 1957, pp. xii, 798, $11.20.

This volume completes the Record of Performances in London from 1751 to 1800. A previous volume (pp. xiv, 517, $8.50) covered the period from, 1701 to 1750 (cf. *SNL* II:4:30) The current volume follows the plan of its predecessor listing first the Daily Calendar of performances for each theatre, and then the plays, casts, and dates. A valuable feature is that the data for each play is introduced by an act by act analysis of the particular version being performed and a brief bibliography of printed editions. Information for this volume was easier to obtain because for the 2nd half of the century there were almost complete runs of daily playbills available. Appendix A lists and discuss the sources; B lists the Theatres; C and D are extremely interesting because they tabulate the material. We learn that there were 3,988 plays by Shakespeare performed in the 2nd half of the century. These, added to the 3,226 from 1701 to 1750, make a total of 7,214. The 18th century grand total of 40,664 gives a ratio of one Shakespearean play to every six that were acted. The record year was 1761 when 73 of Covent Garden's 193 plays were Shakespearean. The smallest number was at the same theatre two years later: 14 out of 183. In the 2nd half of the century *Romeo and Juliet* (399), *Hamlet* (343), *Richard* (323), and *Macbeth*, (27), *Merchant of Venice* (243), and *Taming of the Shrew* (236) were the most popular. The first four plays were also the first four in popularity for the entire 1701-1800 period. (actually *Hamlet, Macbeth, Richard III*, and *Romeo and Juliet* is the final order.) Two indexes—one of actors and one of characters, complete the volume. Readers are reminded that it is wise to consult Arthur J. Scouten's "Caveat for Interpreters of Stage History" in the *Shakespeare Quarterly*, VII:2 (Spring 1956), 189-202, on the arrangement of the data (according to the calendar year rather than the season) and the totals.

Kenneth Macgowan and William Melnitz, The Living Stage, New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955, pp. xiv-543, $6.00.

The authors of this handsome volume trace the history of the stage from its primitive beginnings down to the present day, and illustrate their discussion with 50 helpful black-and-white plates. Chapter 6 is devoted to the theater in the times of Elizabeth I. In some 52 pages and 20 illustrations, the authors provide a succinct account of one of the most important periods in theatrical history. Shakespeare himself is covered in four and one half pages under the headings: "Shakespeare—Man of Mystery," "The Publishing of Shakespeare's Plays," and "Shakespeare's Prosperity."

William K. Wimsatt, ed., English Stage Comedy, English Institute Essays, 1954, New York, Columbia University Press, 1955, pp. x-182, $3.50.

Professor Wimsatt of Yale University opens this discussion of comedy with an introductory essay on "The Criticism of Comedy." In the second essay, C. L. Barber discusses *Henry IV*, and in succeeding essays Bernard Knox sets *The Tempest* in the "Ancient Comic Tradition," Ray L. Heffner, Jr., discusses "Unifying Symbols in the Comedy of Ben Jonson," Marvin Mudrick discusses Restoration Comedy, etc.

Bernard Knox says that in *The Tempest* Shakespeare abandons the familiar *milieux* of his plays for an uncharted island "on which anything can happen." He moves from the "probable impossibility" of the earlier plays to "the complete impossibility" in which ordinary laws governing objects are "imperiously suspended." The master and slaves relationship is typical of ancient comedy, and Ariel's promises of speed sound like those of the Plautine slave. Gonzalo's final speech tying the loose ends together is also traditional.

Professor Barber's paper was abstracted in *SNL*, IV:1:8.

Sir W. W. Greg, Editor, Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, various dates, various pages, $4.00 each.

According to the dust jacket of the last two volumes received there are 23 facsimiles in the current series. The following volumes are currently available. *Merry Wives of Windsor* (1602); *Pericles*, 1609; *R. & J.*, 1599; *Hamlet*, 1603; *T & C.*, 1609; *HV*, 1600; and *LLL*, 1598. Each of the collotype facsimiles-the best known method of reproduction—is preceded by a brief introduction which gives the stationer's register entries and comments on transfers, some details of other Quartos, a census of existing copies, statements as to notable variations, comment on the particular copy used for the facsimile, a statement on typographical peculiarities and act and scene division. No attempt at a full scale critical introduction is made. An added feature of these volumes is the addition of line and scene notations from the 1891 Globe edition in the outside margins. In the case of the 1603 *Hamlet*, the bad quarto, the notation is naturally quite complicated.

The New Century Handbook of English Literature, edited by Clarence L. Barnhart, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., N. Y., 1956, pp. 1167, $12.00.

This handsome, well-printed volume contains over 14,000 entries covering English Literature in all its aspects as well as items in related literatures. Literary periods, authors, important persons, titles, plots, characters, literary terms, biblical and mythological figures, etc., are covered. Articles range from four columns (Shakespeare—naturally) to a single line. Shakespeareans with short memories will find the *New Century Handbook* a handy guide. Each of the plays is represented by a 200-500 word summary of the plot and a brief textual and stage history. For major characters there are short critical interpretations and for minor characters a mere identification. The editorial claim to have covered "every character" is almost correct. In *Romeo and Juliet*, for example, I could not find the Apothecary, Simon Catling, or James Soundpost, although Hugh Rebeck was there. There is so much in the *New Century Handbook* that those who already possess the *Oxford Companion to English Literature* will want the new volume as an important supplement.

W. Schrickx, Shakespeare's Early Contemporaries, Antwerp, De Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1956, pp. viii-291, 250 F. Belg.

Dr. Schrikx believes that "through repeated association with certain events, one idea, one group, and, at times, one man, many mythological terms came to have strong topical and personal meanings," especially at the outset of the Harvey-Nashe controversy. Through his study of "these accretive meanings," Dr. Schrikx is enabled "to shed fresh light on the imaginative and associative processes of the young Shakespeare."

The book begins with a discussion of allegory. In succeeding chapters, Dr. Schrikx discusses Shakespeare's early company connections and the "School of Night," Chapman's *The Shadow of Night*, and the significance of certain myths prevalent in 1590-1593 in relation to Nashe, Abraham Fraunce, Greene, Harvey, and some minor writers, "with a view to determining the matrix from which Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost* seemes to have issued."

Dr. Schrikx concludes that "Shakespeare was writing, or trying to write, for Strange's men in the early months of 1592." He agrees with recent critics that the "School of Night," if it existed, was not a close-knit group in many respects. In the light of echoes of Harvey in *AYLI*, he suggests 1593 as "a not improbable date for Shakespeare's first handling of the play," and he agrees with Charlton that 1592 is the proper dating for *LLL*.

Shakespeare Survey 9, an Annual Survey of Shakespeare Study and Production, edited by Allardyce Nicoll, Cambridge University Press, 1956, pp. 168, $3.75.

SS 9, devoted to studies of Hamlet, begins with a Survey of "Studies in Hamlet, 1901-1955", by Clifford Leech, and follows with scholarly and dramatic studies. Several of the articles are abstracted below. Fredson Bowers' interesting paper on "Hamlet's 'Sullied' or 'Solid' Flesh: a Bibliographical Case History" is here available in print. It was abstracted in *SNL* (VI:2:11) after it was given at Duke University. *SS* is always especially valued for its annual reviews Shakespeareana by Kenneth Muir, R. A. Foakes and James G. McManaway. The series is increasing in value annually.

"The Date of Hamlet," E. A. J. Honigmann, SS, 9, 24-34.

Polonius's reference to his having played the part of Julius Caesar, possible echoes of Marston's *Antonio's Revenge* and of Jonson's *Every Man Out of his Humour*, the reference to the "inhibition," and Gabriel Harvey's autograph note in his edition of *Chaucer* all make "late 1599 to 1601" appear to be the most likely date for the writing of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

"Hamlet and the Court of Elsinore," R. A. Foakes. SS, 9, 35-43.

After examining the language and imagery of *Hamlet*, one sees that the court of Elsinore is at the same time a place of nobility, chivalry, dignity, religion—and a prison, a place of treachery, spying, and, underlying this, corruption. Hamlet recognizes this corruption in himself, too, and he must "stoop" to revenge. It is perhaps a clue to the tragedy that, in revealing the evil in others, Hamlet arouses evil passions in himself.

"Hamlet at the Globe," George F. Reynolds, SS, 9, 49-53.

The old assumption that many of the scenes in *Hamlet* are to be played in the inner stage is not being accepted by modern producers. The thrones should be on the front stage, and, even when the full stage is used, most of the action is on the front part of it. Even Hamlet's scene with Gertrude in her bedchamber should be played on the front stage, though Polonius is, of course, behind the arras. In fact, less than 200 lines of the play are to be spoken from the curtained space.

"Garrick's Stratford Jubilee," Martha Winburn England. SS, 9, 90-100.

The reaction to Garrick's Shakespeare Jubilee held at Stratford-on-Avon in 1769 was a "clear prefiguration" of the development of characteristic romantic attitudes in England, France, and Germany. In England the event was at first satirized, but later this attitude began to give way to the "irrational idolatry" of the 19th century. In France and Germany the event was accepted not as an idea of Garrick's, but as a popular recognition by the English people of Shakespeare as the child of nature. In France Shakespeare worship was angrily attacked by the aging Voltaire, and this slowed the development of the romantic attitude toward the Bard, but in Germany there was no such opposition. Garrick's picture of Shakespeare as a child of nature was repeated in exaggerated form by Goethe.

"Jonson and Shakespeare at Chess"

The Karel van Mander (1548-1606) portrait of two men playing chess which for many years has been called "Jonson and Shakespeare at Chess," is the subject of an informative, documented article—"Is this the Face of Shakespeare?"—in *The Pictou Advocate* of Pictou, Nova Scotia, Canada, on Oct. 17 (pp. 7-8). The illustrated page and a half article was written by Frederick J. Pohl who declares in conclusion that "The cumulative effect of all the evidence establishes the conviction that the Chess portraits does show us Shakespeare's living face." The portrait has made news since the 19th Century, and was once valued at a million dollars, if authenticated. The painting was on exhibition at the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre at Stratford, Conn., last year. It is owned by Mr. Frank de Hayman, an *SNL* subscriber of Brooklyn, New York. (See two column article and reproduction in *SNL* II:7:35.

Antony and the "lass unparallel'd"

Thomas D. Bowman, Pennsylvania State University

In the first half of *Antony and Cleopatra* Shakespeare gives a denigrating characterization of Cleopatra who reaches her lowest point in her capricious and disastrous flight at Actium. With IV.iv., however, he begins to stress her latent nobility of character. Because this brief and seemingly trifling scene contains this new note, it represents the turning point in Cleopatra's character development, the genesis of the audience's moral sympathy toward her, and a significant preparation for her ultimate preference of death to living dishonor. All three developments are foreshadowed by her deliberate refusal to reveal to Antony her premonition that defeat and death await him on his second campaign. She is certain that this is a final goodbye; yet as she prepares her lover for battle she in no sense betrays what is in her heart. She generously stifles all expression of apprehension in order to strengthen Antony's ungrounded hopes that "There's sap in't yet." (III. xiii. 192)[1]

For satisfactory interpretation this scene requires a greater assumption of stage business than is ordinarily made by the intelligent reader of Shakespeare.[2] The meaning of line upon line is reinforced by the actor's accompanying business, yet no detailed attempt to supply it has been made. In view of this neglect at that point where the new and nobler Cleopatra emerges, an explanation of the scene's byplay, implications, and inner action needs to be made.

The setting of IV.iv. is Cleopatra's bedchamber the morning of the second battle. With the opening lines Antony awakens after a night of revelry. In celebration of Cleopatra's birthday and to what Mark Antony believed was to be his last night on earth:

> Haply you shall not see me more, or if,
> A mangled shadow, perchance tomorrow
> You'll serve another master.
> (IV.ii.26-28)

Realizing that there is man's work to be done, he calls for his professional squire, Eros, to outfit him for the eventualities of the day. Yet he is determined for Cleopatra's sake that no sign of fear or agitation will come from him.

A Touch of Domestic Comedy

Just after Antony's peremptory command, Shakespeare, as he often does, inserts a homely touch of domestic comedy. Awakened and annoyed, Cleopatra petulantly deplores this daybreak interruption of her slumber, "Sleep a little." (IV.iv.1)[3] Antony placates her with an endearment, whereupon she flounces out of bed, insisting that she help too in the accoutering, although unqualified for the task. Her "What's this for?" is accompanied by her quizzical scrutiny of a leg-piece and her befuddlement concerning its anatomical destination. Surely she assumes this air of ignorance and engages in this foolery to give Antony the impression that she is unafflicted with misgivings and confident of victory. Amused, and as is always the case, deluded by her play-acting, Antony tells her to desist, pointing out that the morale she contributes is displayed more by the heart than by practical helpfulness. But she persists in her exaggerated fumblings, undoubtedly to feed his sense of humor. Antony laughingly remonstrates with his "False, false" as she futilely attempts to affix a right leg piece to his left leg, and suggests she try the other with his "This, this." She jests on her incompetence with: "Sooth, la, I'll help," but follows his instructions with "Thus it must be." Now fully accoutered, Antony showers her with compliments with his "Well, well," and his insistence that the warrior outfitted by Cleopatra can do nothing but thrive. His "Seest thou, my good fellow?" is the crowning touch of gently ironic praise. To preen her vanity he maintains that the accomplished Eros could still learn a thing or two from her!

When Cleopatra pats his buckle and comments proudly: "Is not this buckled well?" He heaps up praise of her fumblings by replying that it is a rare achievement, that much will abide before it is reposefully "daff't," and that Eros is an incapable fumbler compared with her. Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the fact that both Antony and Cleopatra in this scene are avoiding expression of the apprehension that defeat and death await Antony. For the sake of the other neither will display the slightest sign of anxiety or intimation that these are undoubtedly their last moments together. Antony's wish that Cleopatra could be present at the battle to view his workmanship is especially significant in view of her conduct at Actium.

Cleopatra Matures

With the entrance of the armed soldier and various officers one can safely assume the action shifts to the palace hall. Antony's comments stress his eagerness to face the task ahead. Cleopatra's silence indicates her realization that love, sensuality, and luxury must be discarded when a great and manly duty calls. The armed soldier looks like one worthy of his duty—one rises early if he delights in the task of the day—and the morn is fair and well blown, they have a good day for the battle.

In the hubbub of departure Cleopatra decides that she wants to bestow the finishing touch to Antony's accouterment, the placing of his helmet upon his head. Again she fumbles, attempting to place it on backwards, a natural error except to a soldier. Antony's "So, so, come, give me that. This way," is accompanied by his turning the headpiece around with the front facing Cleopatra and gesturing concerning its proper affixment. Again, with "well said," there is a touch of comic compliment with the job successfully done.

Antony's goodbye is the self-contained undemonstrative goodbye of the professional fighting man,—the goodbye of the soldier who takes going off to war and death as all in the day's work. There is no theatrical lamentation in this lover's leave-taking for war. On Antony's part it is scarcely more than a brusque but most impressive equivalent of "so long, old girl, take care of yourself." On Cleopatra's, an unexpressed acquiescence in stoical self-restraint.

The scene ends with Cleopatra expressing her misgivings of everlasting separation. Now that Antony is gone there is no longer any need to hide them. Obviously grieving, she accepts Charmian's considerate suggestion that she return to her bedchamber. She praises Antony for his gallant departure, well realizing his inner stress. Then her three concluding silences are tremendous in their dramatic implications:

> That he and Caesar might
> Determine this great war in single fight:
> Then Antony—
> IV.iv.36-38

She is certain that were it but a matter of man to man Antony would be the victor.

> But now—

This cryptic phrase contains that world of misgiving which, for Antony's sake, she had to keep hidden throughout the entire scene. Then her final "Well, on" is stated as Chairman and Iras flutter about her with hopeless condolences. She is now resigned to tragic eventualities, whatever they may be. We are now more prepared for the "lass unparalleled" of the final scene.

---

[1] All lines quoted are from the edition of G. B. Harrison (New York, 1952).

[2] Arthur Colby Sprague, **The Stage Business in Shakespeare's Plays** (London, 1953), p. 31.

[3] G. Wilson Knight has Cleopatra mothering Antony here, maintaining that she is solicitous for his health and comfort. Rather she is discommoded by an early awakening the morning after a wild party. See his **The Imperial Theme** (London, 1931), p. 305.

☆DEO VOLENTE☆
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS ☆ UNIVERSITY PRESS

SHAKSPERE'S
LOVE'S
LABOR'S
WON

NEW EVIDENCE FROM THE ACCOUNT BOOKS OF AN ELIZABETHAN BOOKSELLER

By T. W. BALDWIN

In this slim but important book are reproduced in collotype the two rectos and one verso of manuscript leaves discovered by a London book dealer while inspecting the binding on a copy of Thomas Gataker's *Certaine Sermons*, printed and bound presumably in 1637. On these manuscript leaves were listed a series of Shakespeare's plays including *Love's Labor's Won.*

The date on ons of the manuscript leaves offers convincing evidence that there existed in print such a play in August, 1603.

52 pages, three actual-size collotypes **$5.00**

At your booksellers' or

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY PRESS
CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS

8th International Conference At Stratford

The Curtained Space for Discovery in Shakespeare's Globe.

Richard Hosley, University of Missouri

Dr. Hosley proposed the theory that the stage and tiring-house of the First Globe were essentially similar to those of the Swan Theater as depicted in the "De Witt" drawing of 1596. He suggested that at the Globe there was a large rectangular stage, presumably with a trap-door; a stage-cover, supported by two pillars and presumably concealing a lifting-device; a tiring house equipped with two large double-hung doors affording access to the stage; a spectators' gallery or "Lord's room" over the stage in the second level of the tiring-house, presumably divided into boxes and occasionally used as a raised playing-area; and, finally, a curtained space on the level of the stage, occasionally used for discoveries.

Dr. Hosley limited his inquiry into the nature of this curtained space to a consideration of evidence from plays performed at the First Globe, those of the Chamberlain-King's Men dated after spring, 1599, when the Globe was built and before autumn, 1608, when the King's Men presumably began using the Blackfriars as well as the Globe. Of the thirty plays involved sixteen are by Shakespeare and three by Jonson. Twenty-four of the thirty have no discoveries or concealments nor any stage-direction for the drawing of a curtain. In the remaining six plays it was demonstrable that action initiated by a discovery was rarely confined to the curtained space, the players quickly moving forward on to the stage, from which they later walked off into the tiring-house. On the basis of various pieces of evidence Dr. Hosley suggested that hangings were occasionally fitted up along the facade of the Globe tiring-house, masking open stage-doors of the kind shown in the Swan drawing. Such hangings would have had three main functions. First, they would have eliminated the frequent opening and closing of stage-doors by allowing players to enter and exit by slipping through openings in the hangings. Second, they would have provided an "arras" behind which eavesdropping players might "hide." And third, they would have permitted occasional discoveries by means of drawing back the hangings from in front of one of the open stage-doors. Dr. Hosley went on to argue that all instances of discoveries in the plays under discussion required only the amount of space provided by an open stage-door behind such hangings.

Discussion: Professor George F. Reynolds, Chairman.

This was devoted mainly to two topics, the positioning of the hangings and the playing of scenes which presented certain specific difficulties.

Professor Reynolds asked from what the hangings or "arras" would have been hung, and whether there would have been any appreciable space between the hangings and the tiring-house wall. This point was taken up by Mr. C. Walter Hodges, who suggested that the theory worked equally well if a space was left. Dr. Brooks and Mr. Monck emphasized the flexible nature of Elizabethan stage-settings, and Professor Danby asked about the staging of bedroom scenes under such conditions; Professor Sprague pointed out the particular problems of the bedroom scene in *Cymbeline*. Both Professor Stamm and Mr. Mac Owan raised the further question of the number and size of the doors on the Elizabethan stage. Professor Sisson asked if the theory would be generally applicable away from the Globe, and Dr. Hosley said that evidence for the practice in other theaters remained to be investigated.

A Painful Parody
"We ask and ask,and thou art still . ."
and
We are still . . .
Hoping that you will check your name plate and send a renewal. Renewals sent recently will have name plates corrected as soon as possible.

Elizabethan Stage-Practice and the Transmutation of Source Material by the Dramatists

Prof. Rudolf Stamm, Univ. of Bern, Switz.

At the beginning of his paper Professor Stamm indicated to what extent his position depended on acceptance of Granville-Barker's idea that Shakespeare's text should be considered not solely as a work of literature but rather as a "theatrical score" and a play as a kind of "libretto" needing the interpretative arts of actor and producer to give it life on the stage. Professor Stamm emphasized that the study of speech-patterns, imagery, and word-scenery could never be final: that the play in performance should be the governing idea in the researches of the scholars. In our present state of knowledge one study seemed increasingly necessary, the correlation of words and action, of what the actors did with what they said. Consideration of source material had value quite apart from the determination of plot, structure, and character, for a study of it could reveal the intentions of the dramatist when he chose either to report or activate his narrative. Such a study might well display a new relationship of the features that went to form a play's "theatrical physiognomy."

The intensive examination of plays of this period in terms of their theatrical physiognomy should help us not only to group them into categories, but also, perhaps, to assign them with a greater degree of certainty to the repertories of particular companies.

As an example of his method Professor Stamm analyzed in minute detail the opening scenes of *Antony and Cleopatra*, showing how Shakespeare not only transferred a story to the stage but also transmuted the dynamic quality of Plutarch's narrative into dramatic form. He thought such analysis might profitably be extended to other plays, among them *Romeo and Juliet* and *Julius Caesar*.

Discussion: Prof. Robert Davril, Chairman

Dr. Harold Brooks began by suggesting that such a study would be useful in plays where the transmutation is insufficient or incomplete: he instanced *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. The point was taken up by Professor Sisson, who asked if any clear line of development could be discerned in Shakespeare's dramatic use of his sources. Professor Stamm thought that *Antony and Cleopatra* marked a climax, and that in the last plays Shakespeare was attempting something different. After Professor Chwalevik had asserted the literary completeness of the plays, Dr. B. L. Joseph questioned the distinction made between colloquial and declamatory elements, illustrating his comment by analysing Prospero's opening speech, in which he suggested that the character acted as his own "presenter." Mr Duncan Ross said that speech was only a special kind of action and the differentiation should not be urged, though Dr. Brooks saw difficulty with the forensic quality of some passages.

Professor Benvenuto Cellini drew attention to the use of source material in the two versions of *Common Conditions*, and Professor Stamm agreed that the study of sources was of wide application. Professor Danby wondered if *Antony and Cleopatra* were a typical play for source comparison, since its technique seemed more akin to that of the last plays in its use of static "close-up" scenes. Mr. J. C. Maxwell asked if, at the line "the Noblenesse of life is to do thus:" Antony kissed Cleopatra: did the word "thus" indicate a gesture or an abstraction? When Mr. Nugent Monck remarked that it was impossible to be affectionate in a farthingale, which an Elizabethan Cleopatra must have worn, Professor Muir commented that a comparable difficulty with a bass drum was found and overcome in "Major Barbara".

Shakespeare in the News

The *AFL-CIO News* reports the Teamsters' union decision to remove the findings of corruption against James R. Hoffa and his cohorts and comments: "Out damned spot!"

The Value of the First Folio Text for the Speaking of the Verse.

Mr. Michael MacOwan, London Academy of Music and Dramatic Art

The speaker took up Mr. David's conclusion to his lecture of the previous day that the essential Shakespeare must be translated from the printed page into the terms of the theatre.

Disarming biographical objection he spoke of his experience as a producer and Director of the London Academy of Music and Dramatic Art in introducing young actors to the special problems of Shakespeare's text. The greatest problem facing the inexperienced Shakespearian actor was the speaking of blank verse and a study of the First Folio went far to provide a solution. Here the peculiarities of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization were often close to the historical Shakespeare.

Elizabethan spelling could sometimes be of use, for the unusual appearance of the word on the page helped an actor to judge its true quality in speech. The punctuation is dramatic rather than grammatical, and was the best indication of the speed and flow of the words. Even the capitalization could usefully be interpreted in terms of dramatic, and sometimes unexpected emphasis. Mr. MacOwan gave examples of this practical value of the Folio text for his teaching method by reading passages from *Romeo* and *Juliet* and *Hamlet*. He found himself in a measure of agreement with Dr. Joseph's theory of the way in which speech-patterns could best be used, and thought the First Folio text presented these patterns in their clearest form.

The young actor usually unacquainted with any example of an Elizabethan printed book, could by working from the First Folio receive an immediate and valuable stimulus to the mastering of his craft.

Discussion: Prof. Una Ellis-Fermor, Chairman

A most pertinent comment came from Professor J. Dover Wilson when he pointed out that Mr. MacOwan's practical method received powerful scholarly support in Professor Alfred Pollard's Introduction to *"Richard II". A New Shakespeare Quarto.*

[Discussion of Mr. MacOwan's paper was severely curtailed because of the addition to the Conference programme of an address by Professor Samuel Marshak.]

Shakespeare in the U.S.S.R.

Samuel Marshak, Union of Soviet Writers, U.S.S.R.

Professor Marshak brought greetings to the Conference from his fellow countrymen—scholars, actors, stage-producers and all other lovers of Shakespeare. He described how on the Russian stage, even in remote places, Shakespeare was "not a mere visitor, but a resident". The simplest explanation of this popularity was the spread of education: but the true reason lay in Shakespeare himself, for he could be understood by the simplest people and at the same time had a fund of riches for those who could see farther and deeper into his meaning. His work on the Sonnets, the speaker said, had forced him to ask himself why Shakespeare both in these poems, "so full of grace and wisdom", and in many passages from the plays affected him more powerfully than the lines of other poets. He thought that Shakespeare's ultimate optimism—an optimism conscious of life's danger and horror, but still having the courage to look at them with open eyes—was essential to life.

Superficiality divided peoples, the deepest feelings brought unity. He concluded his moving address by reading his own translation of the sonnet "Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth", as a tribute offered in the town of his birth to the place that Shakespeare held in the world and in the heart of man.

During the morning the Conference was visited by an Associated-Rediffusion television unit, who interviewed several of the delegates and recorded a number of informal conversations for a film to be shown by Moscow State Television throughout the U.S.S.R.

SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY

Shakespeare Quarterly, Edited for the Shakespeare Association of America by James G. McManaway, VIII:3 (Summer 1957), 307-384, $8 per annum.

"The Argument of MND," Peter F. Fisher, Royal Military College of Canada, SQ VIII, 307-10.

Because *MND* primarily gives an impression of high fantasy, its "argument" has been ignored. Peter F. Fisher feels that the form of the play's plot revolves around the comic "problem" involving four lovers who represent "the irrational force of sublunary passion in conflict with the rationally ordered world of the Athenian court"; the struggle to resolve the problem is the expression of the argument. The four worlds—Bottom's matter-of-fact, Thescus' rational, the lovers' passionate, and Oberon's fantastic meet in the wood and emerge in proper perspective, with reason in final control over passion, common life disporting for their amusement, and fantasy remaining an undercurrent.

"Enter Lear mad," Sholom J. Kahn, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, SQ VIII, 311-29.

In disagreement with Granville-Barker, Muir, and other critics, Sholom J. Kahn feels that Lear is only in growing stages of madness in III.iv and III.vi, and that the climax of his madness comes in IV.vi. This would account for the Quarto's stage directions (IV.vi.) "Enter Lear mad: "the Folio alteration to read "Enter Lear" may indicate that actor(s) or editor(s) had already adopted the interpretation, prevalent still, that the madness climaxed earlier. A detailed study of the three mad scenes, however, substantiates Dr. Kahn's theory, for they progressively have more and more of Lear's speeches in prose (expressive of his madness), but with only IV.vi. almost all prose, and an analysis of Lear's speeches shows more complete symptoms of insanity in IV.vi. than in IV or III.vi. The delay of this climax makes the dramatic effect greater in IV.vi. than if it had come earlier.

"Recognition and Reversal in A&C," Sylvan Barnet, Tufts University, SQ VIII, 331-4.

Because of *A&C's* lack of classical structure, critics have tended to neglect it. Sylvan Barnet feels, however, that parts of the tragedy can best be explained in Aristotelian terms. The deaths of Antony, Cleopatra, and even Enobarbus, are preceded by a tragic (Aristotelian) recognition (transition from ignorance to knowledge) producing a reversal (unexpected action). Cleopatra's feigned death leads Antony finally to recognize the extent of his love; his death is, however, a reversal of her intention. She, too, recognizes her destiny, and dies only when her attempt to deceive Antony has recoiled upon her. Antony's kindness to Enobarbus similarly provokes in him self-recognition and a reversal of Antony's kind intention, Enobarbus's death.

"Shakespeare in Providence," William T. Hastings, Brown University, SQ VIII, 335-51.

William T. Hastings, Prof. Emeritus at Brown, gives particular attention to the history of drama in Providence in the 1790's because it is not recorded elsewhere in detail. The reproduction of early Providence playbills is also a valuable addition to this article. In general, until about 1875, Providence Shakespeare was acted by local stock companies plus a visiting star. Only a handful of favorite plays were produced. In this century, Shakespeare has been provided mainly by college drama and reading groups, however.

THE DREAM WITHIN A DREAM

Dr. Alexander Crinstein discusses the play within the play as found in *Hamlet* from the point of view of Freud's theory of the dream within the dream, that an event "inserted into a dream as a dream by the dream work itself . . . implies the most decided confirmation of the reality of the event" and also that such an event is one which the dreamer wishes to deny. Thus, in *Hamlet*, the dumb show and play substantiate the events previously reported by the ghost. Furthermore, the play within the play forecasts the death of Claudius. ["The Dramatic Device: A Play within a Play," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, IV (January 1956), 49-52.]

"Notes Notes, Forsooth . . .," Dorothy C. Hockey, Western Reserve University, SQ VIII, 353-8.

Although E. K. Chambers and other critics have found disunity in the Hero-Claudio and Beatrice-Benedick plots of *Much Ado*, Dorothy C. Hockey feels that there is a thematic unity pervading character and dialogue as well as plot. This unity centers around the pun *nothing-noting*, meaning "to attend to, to observe." Eavesdropping, prevalent in the play, is one form of *noting*. The play is a comedy of *mis*-noting, full of deception and misjudgments, illustrating the common human frailty or inability to observe, judge, and act sensibly. The word *noting*, as well as eye-ear emphasis leading to faulty judgments, is prevalent. The plight of each character in both plots is due to faulty noting, and all save Hero are guilty of their own misjudgments—a play of much ado about noting.

"The Birth and Death of Falstaff Reconsidered," Philip Williams, SQ VIII, 358-65.

In his final chapter of *Character and Motive in Shakespeare*, J.I.M. Stewart suggests that Falstaff is a father-substitute for Hal; Prof. E. E. Stoll has attacked Stewart on this point. Philip Williams, late member of English Dept. at University of Virginia, analyzes *Henry IV*, I & II to explore Stewart's theory. The antagonism between Hal and the king is plain, and there are suggestions of contemplated parricide. It was natural for Hal to seek a father-substitute in one unlike his father in the cold, lean, punctilious, sin-ridden qualities he resents—Falstaff. The tavern scene where Falstaff becomes Hal's father and is deposed by Hal is highly significant; Falstaff's role as father is emphasized elsewhere; he is also referred to as Saturn and himself hails Hal as Jove (who deposed his father Saturn). Just as Henry saw England as a wasteland needing the sacrifice of his death to achieve regeneration, so also is Falstaff's death necessary for a ritualistic sacrifice; only after his death is Hal transformed into a dynamic king.

"Shakespeare and the Dance," Walter Sorell, New York City, SQ VIII, 367-84.

During the Elizabethan age, not only accomplished courtiers but also the citizenry of London were quite skillful in foreign courtly, as well as native country, dancing. Elizabeth herself loved and encouraged dancing. The popularity of it is testified to by the numerous London dancing schools, as well as by Puritan attacks against it. Dancing of great skill was thus requisite to the actor, because dances frequently followed or concluded plays, as well as being often included in them. Walter Sorell suggests dances appropriate for Shakespeare's plays, such as a sword dance for the masque of Amazons in *Timon*, a canary for the feast in *R&J*, and a brawl for the shepherds in *Winter's Tale*. He also suggests that Carl Orff's score is closer to the dancing spirit of *MND* than is Mendelssohn's.

WORMS AND THE MAID

Harry Keil identifies the "little Worm/Prick'd from the lazy fingers of a maid" (*R & J*, I, iv) as the *acarus* or mite that causes human scabies. He gives an exhaustive survey of medical and lay knowledge about worms, lice, mites and other parasites from ancient times through the 16th century. It is established that by the 15th century these "handworms" were well known and that the method of extracting them with a needle or some other sharp object was practiced. Mr. Keil believes that in common superstition these itching mites may have been considered a punishment inflicted by Mab on a lazy servant, but he admits that there is nothing extant to prove such a view. ["Scabies and the Queen Mab Passage in *Romeo and Juliet*," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XVIII: (June 1957), 394-410.]

Review of Periodicals:

An American Shakespearean Folklegend

A New Jersey folklore-legend blending Shakespeare, Abelard, and Child's ballad (No. 78) "The Unquiet Grave," illustrates the strange workings of oral tradition, declares Herbert Halpert of Murray State College. According to the legend a rival for Shakespeare's wife hires bravos to castrate the dramatist, hoping thus to alienate the wife's affections. The playwright, feeling inadequate, persuades his wife to enter a convent; but after his death she leaves, visits his grave, and pleads with the poet to arise. Such legends have little, if any, validity; but it would be worthwhile for folklore collectors to "look for, study, and publish legends of this kind for the light they shed upon the still mysterious workings of oral tradition." ["Shakespeare, Abelard, and 'The Unquiet Grave'," *Journal of American Folklore*, LXIX (1956), 74-75.]

SHAKESPEARE AND KEATS

Stuart M. Sperry of Harvard University points out a resemblance between Keat's disrobing Madeline and Shakespeare's drowning Ophelia which reveals Shakespeare's influence on Keats. Madeline is "Half-hidden, like a mermaid in sea-weed . . . ." and Ophelia's "weedy" trophies fall with her into the brook, after which she floats "mermaid-like." Moreover, one of Keat's rejected readings for the lines called Madeline more "melodious" than a siren of the sea, while in the passage about Ophelia's death Shakespeare refers to her "melodious" lay. [Madeline and Ophelia: A Source for 'The Eve of St. Agnes,'" *Notes and Queries* (New Series) IV:1 (January 1957) 29.]

New Year's Resolution:
Send $2.00 for SNL

SHAKESPEAREAN

PLAYS

ON COLOR FILMSTRIPS

Now available—the first seven of a series of color strips made up from photographs of actual Old Vic Productions.
Each strip illustrates the major scenes of a selected play, and the accompanying manual contains extracts from the text relevant to the scene illustrated.

AS YOU LIKE IT

JULIUS CAESAR

HENRY IV PTS. 1 & 2
(Two Strips)

MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR

MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM

RICHARD II

Reviewed in this Journal May 1957—*"no class in Shakespeare should be without them".*

Price $5 Each

Write for details and preview copies to

EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTIONS LTD.

East Ardsley, Wakefield, England

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

Ned B. Allen, University of Delaware; Barbara Alden, Geo. Washington Univ.; Nancy Lee Riffe, U. of Ky.; Gordon W. O'Brien, Youngstown Univ.; Ernst J. Schlochauer, Queens (NYC); Peter J. Seng, Northwestern Univ.; Joseph H. Summerell, Columbia Univ. Grad. School; Gordon Ross Smith, Penna. State U., Bibliographer.

DRAMATICAL NORMS

If the Elizabethan repertory is systematized into characteristic methods of treating recurrent situations, a play can then be studied in the light of prevailing dramatic practices, thinks William W. Main of the University of Redlands. By a study of the 76 extant plays of 1598-1602, he has established dramaturgical norms of the period and presents them systematically according to the treatment, themes, and dramatic roles typical of each. A study of Domestic plots reveals two types: love plots of true love and love plots of infidelity. True love plots have the following conventional treatments: romantic; farcical-satiric; satiric; tragic; and romantic-satiric, i.e., a mixture of hererogeneous norms into a new homogeneous one, achieved successfully only by Shakespeare *12th Night; As You Like It.* Love plots of infidelity have romatic; satiric; corrective humours; pathetic; and tragic treatments. Although some plays contain, in diverse elements of plot, more than one treatment, only Shakespeare successfully fused two norms into a new one.

The Civil Discord plots use melodramatic, romantic, pathetic, satiric, and tragic treatments; these involve (using the same order) a hero who punishes, pardons, suffers, censures, or shares villainy. Shakespeare differs from most dramatists in using the romantic treatment in comedy (*As You Like It*). He is the only one who fuses two treatments in a single play (*Caesar* is both melodramatic and tragic).

Although Satiric plots are used with any subject, they assumed three norms: punitive (dealing with incorrigible follies); corrective (dealing with corrigible follies); and ironic (dealing with self-reproof). Shakespeare alone uses the third, thus combining the first two (Thersites in *Troilus*).

Through fusing the common norms of the period, Shakespeare achieved a new unity. The analysis and recognition of all the norms available to him should lead to a more thorough appreciation of his skill in mingling those elements. ["Dramaturgical Norms in the Elizabethan Repertory," *SP*, LIV:2 (April '57), 128-148.]

TITUS AS RITUAL

William H. Desmonde believes that the plot of *Titus Andronicus* was derived by Shakespeare (or a contemporary) from a Roman play or myth stemming from Greek ritual origins, and ultimately from tribal puberty rites whose purpose was both "to rid the adolescents of their oedipal ambivalence, freeing their energies for higher cultural activities, and to provide an outlet for the hostility of the tribal fathers against their sons." The struggle for kingship, the eating of Chiron and Demetrius, and the proclaiming of Lucius as emperor "closely parallel" the Greek myth of Pelops. The rape of Lavinia "has its counterpart" in the myth of Persephone. "All the salient features of *Titus Andronicus*" are present in these two rituals, but "particularly remarkable" is the fact that they were "regularly performed in the Eleusinian Mysteries." This hypothesis is not negated if Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is accepted as the source. Because the tale of Philomela and Procne occurs in Ovid "at the time of the Dionysian rites, it is likely that these ancient mysteries were the ultimate source for the stories in Book VI of the *Metamorphoses.*" *Titus Andronicus* "is thus the survival of a male and female puberty rite of primitive origins, which survived in classical Greece in the Eleusinian Mysteries." ["The Ritual Origin of Shakespeare's 'Titus Andronicus'," *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, XXXVI (1955), 61-65.]

POPULARITY OF LAMB'S TALES

Mr. David Foxon discusses and describes the six-penny editions of separate tales published between 1807 and 1811. Only one of these, *Othello*, has been considered a first edition prior to the first collected edition, and Mr. Foxon argues against this theory. In all, eight separate tales were published, and various combinations of these appeared as "collections" from 1811 to 1825. A bibliographical description of the extant chapbooks is given following Mr. Foxon's discussion. ["The Chapbook Editions of the Lambs' *Tales from Shakespear*," *The Book Collector* (Spring 1957), 41-53.]

An Important Revision of
Hardin Craig's
SHAKESPEARE
will appear in March 1958
21-Play Edition

Twenty-one plays with full introductions and notes will be presented in a handsome new format which offers illustrations from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources.

Significant revisions in bibliographies, background material, and notes will be included.

1216 pages **$6.75 list**

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY
Chicago
Atlanta
Dallas
Palo Alto
Fair Lawn, N. J.

A MIS-READ 's' IN I HENRY IV?

A number of editors have been puzzled by the word "hest" in *I H IV* (II.iii.62-66): "And in thy face strange motions have appeared,/ Such as we see when men restrain their breath,/ On some great sudden hest./ O, what portents are these?/ Some heavy business hath my lord in hand,/ And I must know it, else he loves me not." Taken in its new English dictionary sense —"bidding, command," says Oliver Steele of the University of Virginia, little sense can be made of the word since the strange motions in Hotspur's face obviously refer to muscular distortion. But the reading, "heft," suggested by Adams in the *New Variorum* perhaps reflects the reading in the MS from which the quarto was derived. "Heft" in the *NED* is "a heave, a strain, a heaving effort," and makes better sense, being supported by line 65 which continues the metaphor. "It would be unfortunate if a possible compositorial error of the first quarto were allowed to obscure the sense of the metaphor." ["*The Explicator*, XIV (June 1956), No. 59].

SHAKESPEARE IN CZECH AND SLOVAKIAN

Frantisek Doucha (1810-1884) first translated *MND* into Czech in 1866. The first performance in this translation was in [sic] 1855, accompanied by Mendelssohn's music. Josef V. Sladek (1845-1912), the greatest of Czech translators of Shakespeare, translated all but six of the plays. His *MND* was performed at Prague in 1896 with Mendelssohn's music, and again in 1901. Bohumil Stapanek translated twenty of the plays, *MND* appearing in 1930 and first performed in 1933. In 1938 Erik A. Saudek translated *MND*, and has since published eight plays with others to come. A new translation by Jiri Valia was performed in 1943, but remains unprinted. The Slovakian translation of *MND* by poet Pavel Orszagh Hviezdoslav (1849-1921) was published in 1931, 1941, and 1949. [Shakespeare's 'Midsummer Night's Dream' in Czech and Slovakian," *Notes and Queries*, New Series IV:4 (April 1957), 151-3.]

THE LANGUAGE OF POETRY

Sigurd Burckhardt, demonstrating the difficulties of the poet's media, concludes that "the function of poetic devices, puns, rhyme, metaphors, meter is dissociative" in order "to release words . . . from their bondage to meaning." Ambiguity becomes "a test case for the poet," and the ambiguity of negation "poses for the poet a crucial problem" to which Sonnet 116 may yield an answer.

Shakespeare here presents language which on the logical face of it "seems nonsense"; but "the dilemma results from the sonnet's being read partly as if it were poetry," and "in poetry two negatives do not make an affirmative." The poet's universe is "a verbal one"; in like manner "*speech* is the marriage of true minds," a marriage which can only be consummated verbally. "Unless words are constant, union of minds is impossible"; but meanings of words are not constant, poetically speaking. Thus, aware of "the ironies of his enterprise, the paradoxes of his medium," when Shakespeare equates "love" with the star, "the equation is not reductive, as in logic, but transformative: 'love' is both itself and the star, both the inarticulate sound and the empty sign." (Sigurd Burckhardt, "The Poet As Fool and Priest," *ELH*, XXIII:4 (December 1956), 279-298.]

TEXT OF 2 & 3 HENRY VI

C. A. Green argues against the widely held view that the *Contention* and the *True Tragedy* represent memorially reported versions of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*. He points to several Folio discrepancies which he feels have been caused by readings of the Quartos and argues that the enormous number of lines omitted, changed, and added in the Quartos supports his own theory that both Folio and Quartos derive independently from a lost play. ["The Quarto-Folio Relationship in '2' and '3 Henry VI' once again," *Notes and Queries*, 201 (October 1956), 420-21.]